Explicit measures for the homogeneous transform

Hubert Holin
Hubert.Holin.1982@Polytechnique.org

September 1, 2016

Abstract

The homogeneous transform has many practical applications outside the realm of mathematics, for instance to represent the proportions of several chemical substances. We aim here to present results about the transformation of measures, which could be used to take into account the uncertainties of the quantities to be homogeneously transformed.

arXiv:1610.02295v1 [math.FA] 3 Oct 2016

Contents

1 Basics of the homogeneous transform **2**
1.1 Building blocks . . . 2
1.2 The trivialisation of the homogeneous transform . . . 2

2 Manifolds and Measures **3**
2.1 Measures on a manifold . . . 3
2.2 Lebesgues-Radon-Nikodým variants . . . 5
2.3 A note about usage . . . 7

3 The homogeneous transform revisited **8**
3.1 Framework . . . 8
3.2 Example measures and their homogeneous transforms . . . 9
3.2.1 Dirac measures . . . 9
3.2.2 Further examples of the non-injectivity . . . 9
3.2.3 Odds and ends . . . 10
3.2.4 Log-normal distributions . . . 10
3.2.5 Multivariate Gamma distributions . . . 11
3.2.6 Multivariate Chi distributions . . . 12
3.3 Further considerations . . . 12

References **14**

1 Basics of the homogeneous transform

1.1 Building blocks

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \neq 0$, we will assimilate $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ as a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

Given q linearly independent points in an affine space, $(M_1, \ldots, M_q)$, recall that the geometric simplex spawned by $\{M_1, \ldots, M_q\}$ is the set of points whose barycentric coordinates with respect to $(M_1, \ldots, M_q)$ are positive, or equivalently, are positive and less than or equal to 1; it concides with the convex hull of $\{M_1, \ldots, M_q\}$. Likewise, the affine space spawned by $\{M_1, \ldots, M_q\}$ is the set of points whose barycentric coordinates with respect to $(M_1, \ldots, M_q)$ are unconstrained.

For $i \in \{1, \ldots, n+1\}$ let $A_i = (\delta_{i,1}, \ldots, \delta_{i,n+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with $\delta_{i,j} = 1$ if $i = j$ and $\delta_{i,j} = 0$ otherwise, and let $O = (0, \ldots, 0)$. Recall ([1]) that the *standard n-dimensional geometric simplex* is the n-dimensional geometric simplex spawned by $\{O, A_1, \ldots, A_n\}$, with $O = (0, \ldots, 0)$, while the *probability simplex* (sometimes also known as the *standard n-dimensional simplex*) is the n-dimensional geometric simplex spawned by $(A_1, \ldots, A_{n+1})$.

Let $B_n = \{(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \left]\, 0; 1 \,\right[^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n x_i < 1\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Let P_n be the affine hyperplane of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ spawned by $\{A_i \mid i \in \{1, \ldots, n+1\}\}$ and $C_n = \{\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} y_i A_i \mid (\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n+1\})\ 0 < y_i < 1\}$. Note that the coordinates of any point in C_n concide with its barycentric coordinates relative to $(A_1, \ldots, A_{n+1})$, and that C_n is the interior both in the sense of the usual topology on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and in the sense of manifolds with boundary, of the probability simplex; likewise, B_n is the interior, both in the sense of the usual topology on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and in the sense of manifolds with boundary, of the standard n-dimensional geometric simplex. Figure 1 illustrates the difference between B_n and C_n. Finally, let $U_{n+1} = \{(y_1, \ldots, y_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} y_i > 0\}$; quite clearly $P_n \subset U_{n+1}$.



Figure 1: The standard n-dimensional geometric simplex (left) and the probability simplex (right).

We now define the *homogeneous transform* as:

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \mathscr{H}_{n+1}\colon & U_{n+1} & \to & P_n \\ & (y_1, \ldots, y_{n+1}) & \mapsto & \left(\dfrac{y_1}{\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} y_i}, \ldots, \dfrac{y_{n+1}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} y_i} \right) \end{array}$$

We note that $\mathscr{H}_{n+1} < U_{n+1} > = P_n$, $\mathscr{H}_{n+1}^- < P_n > = U_{n+1}$, $\mathscr{H}_{n+1} < (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1} > = C_n$ and $\mathscr{H}_{n+1}^- < C_n > = (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1}$. We will denote by the same symbol the function $\mathscr{H}_{n+1}$ and its restriction to $(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1}$ and C_n.

1.2 The trivialisation of the homogeneous transform

We note that $\mathscr{H}_{n+1}$ is a (global) fibration ([2]), both on U_{n+1} and on C_n, the fibre being an open half-line: given can : $P_n \times \mathbb{R}_+^* \to P_n$; $(Q, s) \mapsto Q$ and $\varphi : P_n \times \mathbb{R}_+^* \to U_{n+1}$; $(Q, s) \mapsto s.Q$ (this latter being the component-wise multiplication of the coordinates of Q by s, and being a C^∞-diffeomorphism), we clearly have, denoting again by the same symbols φ and can and their restrictions to the sets of interest,

$\mathscr{H}_{n+1} = \text{can} \circ \varphi^{-1}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U_{n+1} & \xleftarrow{\varphi} & P_n \times \mathbb{R}_+^* \\ {\scriptstyle \mathscr{H}_{n+1}}\downarrow & \swarrow_{\text{can}} & \\ P_n & & \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1} & \xleftarrow{\varphi} & C_n \times \mathbb{R}_+^* \\ {\scriptstyle \mathscr{H}_{n+1}}\downarrow & \swarrow_{\text{can}} & \\ C_n & & \end{array}$$

It is easier to look at this thru a chart; let us thus consider $\mathscr{C}_n : \mathbb{R}^n \to P_n \ ; \ (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \mapsto (x_1, \ldots, x_n, 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)$. We can now build $\mathscr{T}_{n+1} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \ ; \ ((x_1, \ldots, x_n), t) \mapsto \varphi(\mathscr{C}_n(x_1, \ldots, x_n), \mathrm{e}^t) = (\mathrm{e}^t.x_1, \ldots, \mathrm{e}^t.x_n, \mathrm{e}^t.(1 - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i))$ and each of the following graphs commutes, with $\pi_{n+1} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ the canonical projection, and where we have again denoted by the same symbols $\mathscr{T}_{n+1}$, $\mathscr{H}_{n+1}$, $\mathscr{C}_n$ and π_{n+1} and their restrictions to the sets of interest:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} & \xrightarrow{\mathscr{T}_{n+1}} & U_{n+1} \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_{n+1}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathscr{H}_{n+1}} \\ \mathbb{R}^n & \xrightarrow[\mathscr{C}_n]{} & P_n \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} B_n \times \mathbb{R} & \xrightarrow{\mathscr{T}_{n+1}} & (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1} \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_{n+1}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathscr{H}_{n+1}} \\ B_n & \xrightarrow[\mathscr{C}_n]{} & C_n \end{array}$$

$\mathscr{T}_{n+1}$ and $\mathscr{C}_n$ are obviously C^∞-diffeomorphisms, for which we compute at once the following, with $J_{\mathscr{T}_{n+1}}$ and $J_{\mathscr{C}_n}$ the jacobian matrices of $\mathscr{T}_{n+1}$ and $\mathscr{C}_n$ respectively, and with I_n the (n, n) identity matrix:

$$J_{\mathscr{C}_n} = \left[\begin{array}{c} I_n \\ \hline -1 \quad \cdots \quad -1 \end{array}\right] \quad , \quad J_{\mathscr{T}_{n+1}} = \mathrm{e}^t \left[\begin{array}{c|c} & x_1 \\ J_{\mathscr{C}_n} & \vdots \\ & x_n \\ \hline & 1 - (x_1 + \cdots + x_n) \end{array}\right] \quad , \quad \det\left(J_{\mathscr{T}_{n+1}}\right) = \mathrm{e}^{(n+1)\,t}$$

2 Manifolds and Measures

We first present here some general results before applying them to the homogeneous transform and its associated (very simple) manifolds in the next section.

2.1 Measures on a manifold

The topic of measures on a manifold is a classic, well-studied one, with numerous variants (orientable, Riemannian, Lipschitz, infinite-dimensional, *etc.*). For our needs here, we will first briefly restate the idea for C^1-submanifolds of $\mathbb{R}^q$, without border, merely to make our conventions and assumptions clear (note, for instance, that the charts in [3] are backwards). We will assume nothing more than the C^1-submanifold structure, beyond the requirement that V be connected, for simplicity's sake.

We consider on $\mathbb{R}^q$ $(q \neq 0)$, $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{R}^q)$ the usual topology defined by the euclidian metric. Recall that a set $V \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ is a C^1-submanifolds (of $\mathbb{R}^q$) without border, of dimension p if and only if for all $M \in V$, there exists an open neighbourhood U_M of M in $\mathbb{R}^q$ and a C^1-diffeomorphism ψ_M from U_M onto its image $W_M \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{R}^q)$, such that $\psi_M < U_M \cap V > = (\mathbb{R}^p \times \{0_{\mathbb{R}^{q-p}}\}) \cap \psi_M < V >$, with $0_{\mathbb{R}^{q-p}}$ being the 0 of $\mathbb{R}^{q-p}$. ψ_M is called a local chart adapted to M and $\psi_M^{-1}|_{\mathbb{R}^p}$ is called a local parametrisation (it will be advantageous to consider that $\psi_M^{-1}|_{\mathbb{R}^p}$ is a function to $\mathbb{R}^q$ and not just to M, even though its image is indeed in M). We build an atlas, defining a C^1-manifold structure (hence called a C^1-submanifold structure) for V by collecting for each $M \in V$ one local chart adapted to M. Any other atlas built by choosing for each $M \in V$ another local chart adapted to M is of course compatible) with this one (*i.e.* the transition functions from one atlas to the other are C^1-diffeomorphism where their domains overlap.

We now briefly recall the salient points of the C^1-submanifold structure we will need further on:

Lemma 2.1:
If V is a connected C^1-submanifolds of $\mathbb{R}^q$ without border, then its topology is metric, Hausdorff, separable, second countable, locally compact, locally connected and σ-compact. Furthermore it is a normal space and for any given open cover of V, there exists a partition of unity admissible to it. $\$$

Proof: As the topology of V is deduced from that of $\mathbb{R}^q$ which is metric, Hausdorff and separable (*i.e.* there is a countable subset which is everywhere dense), hence is second countable (*i.e.* thas a countable basis, [4, IX, page 18]), it is likewise metric, Hausdorff, separable and second countable.

The manifold construction clearly ensures that the topology of V is locally compact and locally connected. Taken together, the separability and local compactness implies that V is the union of a countable family of compacts (*i.e.* V is σ-compact, [4, IX, page 21]). Furthermore, V is a normal space as it is metrisable ([4, IX, page 43]) hence for any given open cover of V, there exists a partition of unity admissible to it ([4, IX, page 47]). \$

Lemma 2.2:
If V is a connected C^1-submanifolds of $\mathbb{R}^q$, without border, whose defining atlas is $\mathfrak{A}$, then there is a countable atlas $\mathfrak{B}$ defining the same manifold structure of V as $\mathfrak{A}$ and such that the domain of every chart in $\mathfrak{B}$ is a countable union of compact sets. \$

Proof: We follow [5]. As the topology of V is second-countable, there exists a countable family $\mathcal{B}$ of open sets of V which is a basis of its topology. Hence the domain of every chart in $\mathfrak{A}$ is a countable union of elements of $\mathcal{B}$. For each chart $\mathfrak{c} \in \mathfrak{A}$, let $\mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{c}$ be the subset of $\mathcal{B}$ such that the domain of $\mathfrak{c}$ is the union of the elements of $\mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{c}$; let $\mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{A} = \bigcup_{\mathfrak{c}\in\mathfrak{A}} \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{c}$, then $\mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{A}$ is countable.

For each $B \in \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{A}$, choose one chart $\mathfrak{c}$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ in whose domain B is included, and consider $\mathfrak{c}_B$ the restriction of $\mathfrak{c}$ to B. Then the collection of these $\mathfrak{c}_B$ is a countable atlas which, is compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$, and hence also defines the manifold structure of V.

Finally, each domain of our countable atlas is σ-finite, being homeomorphic to an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^p$. \$

To build the measure we are after, assume first that V admits an atlas with just one chart. Hence we consider the open cover of V consisting solely of V, and consider the associated parametrisation $\Phi : \Omega \to V$, with Ω a non-empty subset of $\mathbb{R}^p$. In that case it is possible to define a positive Radon measure $\tilde{\mu}_V : \mathscr{K}(V) \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}^+$ by $\tilde{\mu}_V(\varphi) = \int_\Omega (\varphi \circ \Phi) A_\Phi(t_1, \ldots, t_p)\, dt_1 \ldots dt_p$ with

$$A_\Phi(t_1, \ldots, t_p) = \sqrt{\sum_{1 \leqslant j_1 < \cdots < j_p \leqslant q} \left| \frac{\mathrm{D}(\Phi^{j_1}, \ldots, \Phi^{j_p})}{\mathrm{D}(t_1, \ldots, t_p)} \right|^2}$$

The measure μ_V on $\mathrm{Bor}(V)$ associated with $\tilde{\mu}_V$ therefore verifies $\mu_V = \Phi_* (A_\phi \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^p})$, with $\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^p}$ the Lebesgues measure on $\mathbb{R}^p$; μ_V is thus a pushforward of a *weighted* Lebesgues measure, which reduces to the classical change of variables expression when V is simply an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^q$.

When the atlas has more than one chart, the above is performed on each chart domain, using a partition of unity admissible to the open cover consisting of the domains of the charts in the atlas, and noticing that the measures agree on the overlaps. Furthermore, and quite importantly, one verifies that the measure built does not, in fact, depend upon the specific atlas chosen, so long as it is compatible with the manifold structure

Proposition 2.1:
The measure μ_V is σ-finite. \$

Proof: Given one countable atlas defining the manifold structure of V, we choose a countable family of compacts such that their union is V and that each compact is included in the domain of one chart of the atlas. Their image by the chart will be a compact of $\mathbb{R}^p$, because each chart is an homeomorphism. As the compacts of $\mathbb{R}^p$ have finite Lebesgues measure and the parametrisation are C^1, this proves that each compact of our chosen family will have finite measure for the measure we have built here. Hence, our measure on V is σ-finite. \$

Note that for the applications we present here, we will be in a situation where an atlas with just one chart will suffice.

2.2 Lebesgues-Radon-Nikodým variants

We will follow the conventions of [6] and consider that a *complex* measure never takes the value $+\infty$. Given a (positive or complex) measure λ on some measurable set and a (positive) measure μ on that same measurable set, we will indicate the fact that λ is absolutely continuous with respect to μ by the notation $\lambda \ll \mu$, and likewise, if λ_1 and λ_2 are two (positive or complex) measures, we will indicate the fact that λ_1 and λ_2 are mutually singular by the notation $\lambda_1 \perp \lambda_2$. Given $(X, \mathscr{A}, \mu)$ a measure space (with μ positive) and λ a complex measure on $(X, \mathscr{A})$, we will denote by (λ_a, λ_s) the Lebesgues decomposition of λ relative to μ, *i.e.* λ_a and λ_s are the unique complex measures such that $\lambda = \lambda_a + \lambda_s$, $\lambda_a \ll \mu$ and $\lambda_s \perp \mu$.

Given two measurable spaces $(X_1, \mathscr{A}_1)$ and $(X_2, \mathscr{A}_2)$, we will denote by $\mathscr{M}((X_1, \mathscr{A}_1), (X_2, \mathscr{A}_2))$ the set of measurable (point-wise) functions from $(X_1, \mathscr{A}_1)$ to $(X_2, \mathscr{A}_2)$. If μ_1 is a measure on $(X_1, \mathscr{A}_1)$, we will denote as usual by $\Phi_* \mu_1$ the push forward of μ_1, by Φ, *i.e.* the measure μ_2 on $(X_2, \mathscr{A}_2)$ defined by $(\forall E \in \mathscr{A}_2)\ \mu_2(E) = \mu_1(\Phi^- < E >)$.

Definition: Given $(X_1, \mathscr{A}_1, \mu_1)$ and $(X_2, \mathscr{A}_2, \mu_2)$ two measure spaces and $\Phi \in \mathscr{M}((X_1, \mathscr{A}_1), (X_2, \mathscr{A}_2))$, we will say (departing slightly from [7]) that Φ is a *morphism of measure spaces* if and only if $\Phi_* \mu_1 = \mu_2$.

Lemma 2.3:
Let $(X_1, \mathscr{A}_1, \mu_1)$ and $(X_2, \mathscr{A}_2, \mu_2)$ be two measure spaces (μ_1 and μ_2 positive) and $\Phi : X_1 \to X_2$ a morphism of measure spaces. Let λ be a complex measure on $(X_1, \mathscr{A}_1)$.

a) If $\lambda \ll \mu_1$ then $\Phi_* \lambda \ll \mu_2$.

b) If Φ is injective *and $\lambda \perp \mu_1$ then $\Phi_* \lambda \perp \mu_2$.* *$*

Proof: Assume that $\lambda \ll \mu_1$. Let $Y \in \mathscr{A}_2$ such that $\mu_2(Y) = 0$. We then have $\mu_2(Y) = \mu_1(\Phi^- < Y >)$ because Φ is a morphism and hence $\mu_1(\Phi^- < Y >) = 0$. By definition, $(\Phi_* \lambda)(Y) = \lambda(\Phi^- < Y >)$. Since $\mu_1(\Phi^- < Y >) = 0$ and $\lambda \ll \mu_1$ we find that $\lambda(\Phi^- < Y >) = 0$ which means that $(\Phi_* \lambda)(Y) = 0$. This proves the first assertion of the lemma.

Assume that $\lambda \perp \mu_1$. Let $V_1 \in \mathscr{A}_1$ and $W_1 \in \mathscr{A}_1$ such that $V_1 \cap W_1 = \varnothing$, $(\forall Z \in \mathscr{A}_1)\ \mu_1(Z) = \mu_1(Z \cap V_1)$ and $(\forall Z \in \mathscr{A}_1)\ \lambda(Z) = \lambda(Z \cap W_1)$. Let $V_2 = \Phi < V_1 >$ and $W_2 = \Phi < W_1 >$; since Φ is *injective*, and $V_1 \cap W_1 = \varnothing$ we see that $V_2 \cap W_2 = \varnothing$. For any $Y \in \mathscr{A}_2$ we note that $\mu_2(Y) = \mu_1(\Phi^-(\Phi^- << Y >) = \mu_1(\Phi^- < Y > \cap\ V_1)$. Since Φ is *injective*, $V_1 = \Phi^- < \Phi < V_1 > > = \Phi^- < V_2 >$, and thus $\mu_2(Y) = \mu_1(\Phi^- < Y > \cap\ \Phi^- < V_2 >) = \mu_1(\Phi^- < Y \cap V_2 >)$, the later equality being due, once again to the injectivity of Φ . Since $\mu_1(\Phi^- < Y \cap V_2 >) = \mu_2(Y \cap V_2)$, we finally find that $\mu_2(Y) = \mu_2(Y \cap V_2)$. Likewise, taking the positive and negative variations of the real and imaginary parts of λ, $(\Phi_* \lambda)(Y) = (\Phi_* \lambda)(Y \cap W_2)$. This proves the second assertion of the lemma. $

The injectivity is sufficient to prove the second assertion above, but is not necessary: for $\Phi : [0; 2[\to [0; 1[$ such that $\Phi(x) = x - E(x)$, with $E(x)$ the integer part of x, and λ the Lebesgues measure on $[0; 2[$, we find that $\Phi_* \lambda = 2\lambda$ (denoting by the same symbol λ and its restriction to $[0; 1[$), and certainly, $\nu \perp \lambda \Leftrightarrow \nu \perp (2\lambda)$. However, that assertion can also be wrong when Φ is not injective: for $\Phi : [0; 1] \to [0; 1], x \mapsto 1/2$, λ the Lebesgues measure on $[0; 1]$, and $\delta_{1/2}$ the Dirac measure at $1/2$, we do have $\delta_{1/2} \perp \lambda$, but $\Phi_* \lambda = \Phi_* \delta_{1/2} = \delta_{1/2}$!

Proposition 2.2 (stability):
Let $(X_1, \mathscr{A}_1, \mu_1)$ and $(X_2, \mathscr{A}_2, \mu_2)$ be two measure spaces (μ_1 and μ_2 positive) and $\Phi : X_1 \to X_2$ an injective *morphism of measure spaces. Let λ_1 and λ_2 be complex measures on $(X_1, \mathscr{A}_1)$ and $(X_2, \mathscr{A}_2)$ respectively and $(\lambda_{1,a}, \lambda_{1,s})$ and $(\lambda_{2,a}, \lambda_{2,s})$ the Lebesgues decompositions of λ_1 with respect to μ_1 and λ_2 with respect to μ_2 respectively. If $\Phi_* \lambda_1 = \lambda_2$, then $\Phi_* \lambda_{1,a} = \lambda_{2,a}$ and $\Phi_* \lambda_{1,s} = \lambda_{2,s}$.* *$*

Proof: We find immediately that $\Phi_* \lambda_1 = \Phi_* \lambda_{1,a} + \Phi_* \lambda_{1,s} = \lambda_{2,a} + \lambda_{2,b}$, Lemma 2.3 tels us that $\Phi_* \lambda_{1,a} \ll \lambda_2$, $\Phi_* \lambda_{1,s} \perp \lambda_2$, and using the fact that the Lebesgues decomposition of a measure is unique, we have proved the assertion. $

Lemma 2.4:
Let $(X_1, \mathscr{A}_1, \mu_1)$ and $(X_2, \mathscr{A}_2, \mu_2)$ be two measure spaces (μ_1 and μ_2 positive) and $\Phi : X_1 \to X_2$ a morphism of measure spaces. If Φ is bijective *and Φ^{-1} is measurable, then Φ^{-1} is also a morphism of measure spaces.$*

Definition: A function verifying the hypotheses of lemma 2.4 will be called a *metromorphism*.

Proof: For any $E_1 \in \mathscr{A}_1$ consider $E_2 = \Phi < E_1 > = (\Phi^{-1})^- < E_1 >$; since Φ^{-1} is measurable we have $E_2 \in \mathscr{A}_2$. Since Φ is a morphism of measure spaces, $\mu_2(E_2) = \mu_1(\Phi^- < E_2 >) = \mu_1(\Phi^- < \Phi < E_1 >>) = \mu_1(E_1)$, but $E_2 = (\Phi^{-1})^- < E_1 >$ so $\mu_1(E_1) = \mu_2((\Phi^{-1})^- < E_1 >)$. Finally $\mu_1 = (\Phi^{-1})_* \mu_2$. \$

Given a measure space $(X, \mathscr{A}, \mu)$, we will denote by $\mathscr{L}^0(\mu)$ the set $\mathscr{M}((X_1, \mathscr{A}_1), (\mathbb{R}, \mathrm{Bor}(\mathbb{R})))$, with $\mathrm{Bor}(\mathbb{R})$ the borelians of $\mathbb{R}$, by $\mathrm{L}^0(\mu)$ the set of classes of elements of $\mathscr{L}^0(\mu)$ with are μ-a.e. equal, by $\mathscr{E}^0(\mu)$ the set of elementary functions, *i.e.* the set of functions which are finite linear combinations of indicator functions of μ-measurable sets, by $\mathrm{E}^0(\mu)$ the set of classes of such functions, and by $\mathrm{E}^1(\mu)$ the set of μ-integrable (classes of) elementary functions. Recall that $\mathrm{L}^1(\mu)$ is a Banach space, and that $\mathrm{E}^1(\mu)$ is an everywhere dense vector subspace (this latter being a consequence of $\mathrm{L}^1(\mu)$ being the completion of $\mathrm{E}^1(\mu)$ for the L^1 norm).

Lemma 2.5:
Let $(X_1, \mathscr{A}_1, \mu_1)$ and $(X_2, \mathscr{A}_2, \mu_2)$ be two measure spaces, with μ_1 and μ_2 positive, and $\Phi : X_1 \to X_2$ a metromorphism between the two. Then given $H \in \mathrm{L}^0(\mu_1)$, $H \circ \Phi^{-1}$ is well defined, $(\forall h_1 \in \mathrm{E}^1(\mu_1))$ $h_2 = h_1 \circ \Phi^{-1} \in \mathrm{E}^1(\mu_2)$ and $[\mathrm{E}^1(\mu_1) \to \mathrm{E}^1(\mu_2); h_1 \mapsto h_1 \circ \Phi^{-1}]$ is (a linear operator which is) an isometry for the L^1 norms. \$

Proof: Let $H \in \mathrm{L}^0(\mu_1)$, and let $f : X_1 \to \mathbb{R}$ and $g : X_1 \to \mathbb{R}$ be two point-wise representatives of H. Let Z be the (possibly empty) set $\{w \in X_1 | f(w) \neq g(w)\}$. By definition, $\mu_1(Z) = 0$. Since Φ is a metromorphism, $\mu_2(\Phi < Z >) = \mu_1(Z) = 0$. But $\Phi < Z >$ is precisely the (possibly empty) set of points in X_2 where $f \circ \Phi^{-1}$ and $g \circ \Phi^{-1}$ differ. Finally, $f \circ \Phi^{-1}$ and $g \circ \Phi^{-1}$ are μ_2-a.e. equal, and $H \circ \Phi^{-1}$ is well defined.

Let $k \in \mathrm{E}^1(\mu_1)$, $k = \sum_{j=0}^N \alpha_j \mathbb{1}_{W_j}$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$, with the $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{C}$ and $W_j \in \mathscr{A}_1$, $\mu_1(W_j)$ finite. We compute at once that $k \circ \Phi^{-1} = \sum_{j=0}^N \alpha_j \mathbb{1}_{\Phi < W_j >}$. Since Φ is a metromorphism, Lemma 2.4 assures us that $\Phi < W_j > \in \mathscr{A}_1$ and thus that $k \circ \Phi^{-1} \in \mathrm{L}^0(\mu_2)$. Furthermore, $\Phi^- < \Phi < W_j >> = W_j$ so $\mu_2(\Phi < W_j >) = \mu_1(\Phi^- < \Phi < W_j >>) = \mu_1(W_j)$ and $\mu_2(\Phi < W_j >)$ is therefore finite. Finally, $k \circ \Phi^{-1} \in \mathrm{E}^1(\mu_2)$ and $\|k\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\mu_1)} = \|k \circ \Phi^{-1}\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\mu_2)}$. \$

Lemma 2.6 (isometry):
Let $(X_1, \mathscr{A}_1, \mu_1)$ and $(X_2, \mathscr{A}_2, \mu_2)$ be two measure spaces, with μ_1 and μ_2 positive, and $\Phi : X_1 \to X_2$ a metromorphism between the two. Then $(\forall h_1 \in \mathrm{L}^1(\mu_1))$ $h_2 = h_1 \circ \Phi^{-1} \in \mathrm{L}^1(\mu_2)$ and $[\mathrm{L}^1(\mu_1) \to \mathrm{L}^1(\mu_2)$; $h_1 \mapsto h_1 \circ \Phi^{-1}]$ is an isometry for the L^1 norms. \$

Proof: Given Lemma 2.5, the operator $\Psi = [\mathrm{E}^1(\mu_1) \to \mathrm{E}^1(\mu_2); h_1 \mapsto h_1 \circ \Phi^{-1}]$ has a prolongation to $\mathrm{L}^1(\mu_1)$, with image in $\mathrm{L}^1(\mu_2)$, which is also an isometry and that we will denote by Ψ as well.

Let $H \in \mathrm{L}^1(\mu_1)$, and h a point-wise representative of H. Since $\mathrm{E}^1(\mu_1)$ is dense in $\mathrm{L}^1(\mu)$, we can find a sequence $(K_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in (\mathrm{E}^1(\mu_1))^{\mathbb{N}}$ which converges to H for the L^1-norm. Let us now consider $(k_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, where the k_i are point-wise representatives of the K_i. By extracting, if need be, a subsequence, we may assume that $(k_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to h μ_1-a.e.. Let Z be the (perhaps empty) set of points of X_1 where $(k_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ does *not* converges to h. Then if $y \in X_2$ and $y \notin \Phi < Z >$ we have the convergence of $(k \circ \Phi^{-1})(y)$ to $(h \circ \Phi^{-1})(y)$. Since Φ is a metromorphism, $\mu_2(\Phi < Z >) = \mu_1(Z) = 0$. Therefore, $k \circ \Phi^{-1}$ converges to $h \circ \Phi^{-1}$ μ_2-a.e.. Since $(K_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges for the $L^1(\mu_1)$ norm, it is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathrm{E}^1(\mu_1)$ for that norm, and since Ψ is an isometry from $\mathrm{E}^1(\mu_1)$ to $\mathrm{E}^1(\mu_2)$, $(K_i \circ \Phi^{-1})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathrm{E}^1(\mu_2)$ for the $L^1(\mu_2)$ norm. Therefore, $(K_i \circ \Phi^{-1})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to some $F \in \mathrm{L}^1(\mu_2)$. Once again taking a subsequence, if need be, we may assume that $(k_i \circ \Phi^{-1})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges μ_2-a.e. to f, where f is a point-wise representative of F. But then μ_2-a.e. $f = h \circ \Phi^{-1}$ and thus $H \circ \Phi^{-1} = F \in \mathrm{L}^1(\mu_2)$.

Finally, the linear isometry Ψ is such that $(\forall H \in \mathrm{L}^1(\mu_1))$ $\Psi(H) = H \circ \Phi^{-1}$. \$

Recall that the Radon-Nikodým theorem ensures, that if μ is a positive, σ-finite, measure on a measurable space $(X, \mathscr{A})$ and λ is a complex measure on $(X, \mathscr{A})$, absolutely continuous with respect to μ, then there is a unique $h \in \mathrm{L}^1(\mu)$ (the Radon-Nikodým derivative of λ with respect to μ) such that $(\forall E \in \mathscr{A})$ $\lambda(E) = \int_E h \, d\mu$.

Proposition 2.3 (densities):
Let $(X_1, \mathscr{A}_1, \mu_1)$ and $(X_2, \mathscr{A}_2, \mu_2)$ be two measure spaces, with μ_1 and μ_2 positive and σ-finite, and $\Phi : X_1 \to X_2$ a metromorphism between the two. Let λ_1 be a complex measure on $(X_1, \mathscr{A}_1)$ absolutely

continuous with respect to μ_1, and h_1 the Radon-Nikodým derivative of λ_1 with respect to μ_1. If $\lambda_2 = \Phi_* \lambda_1$ then λ_2 is absolutely continuous with respect to μ_2, and its Radon-Nikodým derivative with respect to μ_2 is $h_2 = h_1 \circ \Phi^{-1}$. $\$$

Proof: The fact that $\lambda_2 \ll \mu_2$ results immediately from Lemma 2.3.

Let $E \in \mathscr{A}_2$. By definition of the pushforward, $\lambda_2(E) = (\Phi_* \lambda_1)(E) = \lambda_1(\Phi^- < E >)$, and by our hypothesis, $\lambda_1(\Phi^- < E >) = \int_{\Phi^- <E>} h_1 \, d\mu_1$. Since $\mathrm{E}^1(\mu_1)$ is dense in $\mathrm{L}^1(\mu)$, we can find a sequence $(k_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in (\mathrm{E}^1(\mu_1))^{\mathbb{N}}$ which converges to h_1 for the L^1-norm, and then of course $\int_{\Phi^- <E>} k_i \, d\mu_1$ converges to $\int_{\Phi^- <E>} h_1 \, d\mu_1$.

For any $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $k_{i_0} = \sum_{j=0}^{N_{i_0}} \alpha_j \mathbb{1}_{W_j}$ for some $N_{i_0} \in \mathbb{N}$, with the $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{C}$ and $W_j \in \mathscr{A}_1$. We see that $\int_{\Phi^- <E>} k_{i_0} \, d\mu_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{N_{i_0}} \alpha_j \int_{\Phi^- <E>} \mathbb{1}_{W_j} \, d\mu_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{N_{i_0}} \alpha_j \int_{\Phi^- <E> \cap W_j} d\mu_1$. Since we have assumed that Φ is a metromorphism, it is in particular injective, so $W_j = \Phi^- < \Phi < W_j >>$ and thus $\Phi^- < E > \cap W_j = \Phi^- < E \cap \Phi < W_j >>$. Furthermore, being a metromorphism also implies (because a requirement is that Φ^{-1} is measurable) that $\Phi < W_j > \in \mathscr{A}_2$. We therefore find that $\int_{\Phi^- <E>} k_{i_0} \, d\mu_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{N_{i_0}} \alpha_j \mu_2(E \cap \Phi < W_j >) = \sum_{j=0}^{N_{i_0}} \alpha_j \int_E \mathbb{1}_{\Phi<W_j>} \, d\mu_2 = \int_E l_{j_0} \, d\mu_2$, with $l_{j_0} = \sum_{j=0}^{N_{i_0}} \alpha_j \mathbb{1}_{\Phi<W_j>}$ or, in other words, $l_{j_0} = k_{j_0} \circ \Phi^{-1}$. The function l_{j_0} takes a finite number of values, and is a linear combination of indicator functions of measurable sets; it is therefore an elementary function. Since $\mu_2(\Phi < W_j >) = \mu_1(W_j)$ which is finite, we find that in fact $l_{j_0} \in \mathrm{E}^1(\mu_2)$.

Using Lemma 2.6, $(l_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $h_1 \circ \Phi^{-1}$ in $\mathrm{L}^1(\mu_2)$ and therefore $\int_{\Phi^- <E>} k_{i_0} \, d\mu_1$ converges to $\int_E (h_1 \circ \Phi^{-1}) \, d\mu_2$.

Finally, $\lambda_2(E) = \int_E (h \circ \Phi^{-1}) \, d\mu_2$ and thus $h_2 = h_1 \circ \Phi^{-1}$. $\$$

When X_1 and X_2 are open subsets of some $\mathbb{R}^n$, μ_1 and μ_2 are the Lebesgues measure and Φ is a C^1-diffeomorphism, this result is classical ([8]).

2.3 A note about usage

For the use at hand, we are given two measure spaces $(X, \mathscr{A}, \mu)$ and $(Y, \mathscr{B}, \nu)$, with μ and ν positive, a function $H \in \mathscr{M}((X, \mathscr{A}), (Y, \mathscr{B}))$. We want to compute, for various complex measures λ on $(X, \mathscr{A})$, $\rho = H_* \lambda$, and notably (ρ_a, ρ_s), the Lebesgues decomposition of ρ with respect to ν .

In our particular context, we are also given two additional measure spaces $(S, \mathscr{C}, \sigma)$ and $(T, \mathscr{D}, \tau)$, with σ and τ positive, a function $G \in \mathscr{M}((S, \mathscr{C}), (T, \mathscr{D}))$, and $\Phi : S \to X$ and $\Psi : T \to Y$ two metromorphisms such that the following graph commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (S, \mathscr{C}, \sigma) & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & (X, \mathscr{A}, \mu) \\ {\scriptstyle G}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle H} \\ (T, \mathscr{D}, \tau) & \xrightarrow[\Psi]{} & (Y, \mathscr{B}, \nu) \end{array}$$

Let $\eta = (G \circ \Phi^{-1})_* \lambda = G_* (\Phi^{-1}{}_* \lambda)$. We find at once that $\rho = \Psi_* \eta$, and using the results proved above, we find that $\rho_s = \Psi_* \eta_s$ and $\rho_a = \Psi_* \eta_a$, with (η_a, η_s), the Lebesgues decomposition of η with respect to τ:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (S, \mathscr{C}) & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & (X, \mathscr{A}) : \lambda \\ {\scriptstyle G}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle H} \\ (T, \mathscr{D}) : \eta & \xrightarrow[\Psi]{} & (Y, \mathscr{B}) : \rho \end{array}$$

While we replace one set of problems (computing ρ, ρ_a and ρ_s) with a larger set of problems (computing η, η_a, η_s, $\Psi_* \eta_a$ and $\Psi_* \eta_s$), we will only do this when the resulting problems are each more tractable than our original ones. Actually, in practice, we will usually be satisfied with just computing η_a and η_s, as we will see presently.

3 The homogeneous transform revisited

3.1 Framework

We can now put the objects and results of Section 1 into the perspective afforded by Section 2.

The graphs of subsection 1.2 fit into the usage pattern delineated in subsection 2.3; this is outlined for one of them, the substitutions necessary for the other being obvious.

With the notations of 2.3, we start by taking $X = U_{n+1}$, $Y = P_n$ and $H = \mathscr{H}_{n+1}$. As well, we will choose $S = \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, $T = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $G = \pi_{n+1}$, $\Phi = \mathscr{T}_{n+1}$ and $\Psi = \mathscr{C}_n$.

Ultimately, we will compute measures on Y, so our choices will be guided from that end. As stated earlier, we are in a situation in which Y is a (trivial) manifold completely described by one parametrisation, so it will be interesting to have as a reference measure on Y the manifold measure derived from the Lebesgues measure as described in subsection 2.1, which we will denote by μ_{P_n} in accordance with our earlier convention; this also entails that we choose $\mathscr{B} = \mathrm{Bor}(P_n)$, with $\mathrm{Bor}(P_n)$ the borelian sets of P_n.

As we want Ψ to be a metromorphism, we will take $\mathscr{D} = \mathrm{Bor}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, with $\mathrm{Bor}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the borelian sets of $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $\tau = A_{\mathscr{C}_n}\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n}$, with $\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ the Lebesgues measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Hence $\mu_{P_n} = \mathscr{C}_n * (A_{\mathscr{C}_n}\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n})$.

Finally, we will be considering traditional measures on U_{n+1} to transform, but we also want Φ to be a metromorphism, so we will take $\mathscr{C} = \mathrm{Bor}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$, with $\mathrm{Bor}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$ the borelian sets of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, $\mathscr{A} = \mathrm{Bor}(U_{n+1})$, with $\mathrm{Bor}(U_{n+1})$ the borelian sets of U_{n+1}, but for convenience's sake, we will take $\sigma = \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}$, the Lebesgues measure on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $\mu = \Phi * \sigma = \mathscr{T}_{n+1} * \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}$; we will also denote μ as chosen here by $\mu_{U_{n+1}}$, which is also coherent with the notations of subsection 2.1.

Using subsection 1.2 we see that $\det\left(J_{\mathscr{T}_{n+1}}\right) = \mathrm{e}^{(n+1)\,t} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} y_i\right)^{(n+1)}$ with $(y_1, \cdots, y_{n+1}) = \mathscr{T}_{n+1}((x_1, \cdots, x_n), t)$ and therefore $\mu = \left|\det\left(J_{\mathscr{T}_{n+1}}\right)\right|^{-1} \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} y_i\right)^{-(n+1)} \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}$ and subsection 2.1 gives us $A_{\mathscr{C}_n} = \sqrt{n+1}$. We can therefore annotate thus the graph of subsection 2.3:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}, \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}) = (S, \sigma) & \xrightarrow{\Phi = \mathscr{T}_{n+1}} & (X, \mu) = \left(U_{n+1}, \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} y_i\right)^{-(n+1)} \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}\right) \\ \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_{n+1} = G} & & \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle H = \mathscr{H}_{n+1}} \\ (\mathbb{R}^n, \sqrt{n+1}\ \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n}) = (T, \tau) & \xrightarrow[\Psi = \mathscr{C}_n]{} & (Y, \nu) = (P_n, \mu_{P_n}) \end{array}$$

Note that as we are dealing with a manifold, albeit a trivial one (P_n), as the ultimate destination set, it will be advantageous to read our measures thru the parameterisations, *i.e.* only compute η_a and η_s.

For convenience's sake we will adopt the following notations in this section, which are also coherent with those of subsection 2.1: $\mu_{(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1}} = \mu_{U_{n+1}}|_{(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1}}$, $\mu_{C_n} = \mu_{P_n}|_{C_n}$.

It is a trivial application of the Fubini-Lebesgues theorem to see that π_{n+1} is not a metromorphism, and therefore neither is $\mathscr{H}_{n+1}$ (because $\mathscr{T}_{n+1}$ and $\mathscr{C}_n$ *are* metromorphisms), and thus lemma 2.3 can not be used in that context. however some part of it, though not all (see 3.2.3), can still be salvaged:

Lemma 3.1:
Let λ be a complex measure on $(U_{n+1}, \mathrm{Bor}(U_{n+1}))$ such that $\lambda \ll \mu_{U_{n+1}}$, then $(\mathscr{H}_{n+1} * \lambda) \ll \mu_{P_n}$. $

Proof: Let $B \in \mathrm{Bor}(P_n)$ such that $\mu_{P_n} < B >= 0$. By definition, $(\mathscr{H}_{n+1} * \lambda) < B >= \lambda(\mathscr{H}_{n+1}^{-1} < B >)$.

Since $\mathscr{T}_{n+1}$ is a metromorphism, $\lambda(\mathscr{H}_{n+1}^{-1} < B >) = (\mathscr{T}_{n+1}^{-1} * \lambda)((\mathscr{T}_{n+1}^{-1} \circ \mathscr{H}_{n+1}^{-1}) < B >)$.

However, $(\mathscr{T}_{n+1}^{-1} \circ \mathscr{H}_{n+1}^{-1}) < B >= (\pi_{n+1}^{-1} \circ \mathscr{C}_n^{-1}) < B >$ because of the commutativity of the graph, and $(\pi_{n+1}^{-1} \circ \mathscr{C}_n^{-1}) < B >= \pi_{n+1}^{-1} < \mathscr{C}_n^{-1} < B >> = \mathscr{C}_n^{-1} < B > \times \mathbb{R}$, this later by definition of π_{n+1}.

Therefore, $(\mathscr{H}_{n+1} * \lambda) < B >= (\mathscr{T}_{n+1}^{-1} * \lambda)(\mathscr{C}_n^{-1} < \} > \times\ \mathbb{R})$.

We have assumed that $\lambda \ll \mu_{U_{n+1}}$. Since $\mathscr{T}_{n+1}$ is a metromorphism, $(\mathscr{T}_{n+1}^{-1} * \lambda) \ll \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}$, and therefore there exists $f \in \mathrm{L}^1(\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}})$ such that $(\mathscr{T}_{n+1}^{-1} * \lambda)(\mathscr{C}_n^{-1} < B > \times\ \mathbb{R}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathscr{C}_n^{-1} < B > \times\ \mathbb{R}}(t)\ f(t)\ dt$.

Since $\mathscr{C}_n$ is a metromorphism, $\mu_{P_n} < B >= 0$ implies that $\sqrt{n+1}\ \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\mathscr{C}_n^{-1} < B >) = 0$, which of course means that $\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\mathscr{C}_n^{-1} < B >) = 0$. But then, the Fubini-Lebesgues theorem proves that $\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}(\mathscr{C}_n^{-1} < B > \times\ \mathbb{R}) = 0$. Integrating an integrable function over a set of measure zero yielding a result of zero, we have proved that $(\mathscr{H}_{n+1} * \lambda) < B >= 0$. $

As well, the following simple fact is useful to remember:

Lemma 3.2:
Let ζ be a complex measure on $\left(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \mathrm{Bor}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})\right)$ such that $\zeta \ll \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}$, then $(\pi_{n+1} * \zeta) \ll \left(\sqrt{n+1}\ \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n}\right)$ and

$$\frac{d\left(\pi_{n+1} * \zeta\right)}{d\left(\sqrt{n+1}\ \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n}\right)}(x_1, \cdots, x_n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{d\zeta}{d\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}}(x_1, \cdots, x_n, t)\ dt \qquad \$$$

Proof: This is a direct application of the Fubini-Lebesgues theorem. $\$$

Finally, recall[1] that $\lambda_n(B_n) = \frac{1}{n!}$ and[2] that $\mu_{C_n}(C_n) = \frac{\sqrt{n+1}}{n!}$.

3.2 Example measures and their homogeneous transforms

While the primary aim of these examples is to be illustrative, it is hoped that some of them will turn out to also be useful in practice.

Let $\mathscr{D}_{(a_1,\ldots,a_{n+1})} : \left[B_n \to \mathbb{R}; (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \mapsto \left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{a_i}\right)\left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)^{\alpha_{n+1}-1}\right]$, with $a_1 > 0, \cdots, a_{n+1} > 0$. Here, as usual, $\mathrm{B} : \left[\left(\mathbb{R}_+^*\right)^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}_+^*; (a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1}) \mapsto \int_{B_n} \mathscr{D}_{(a_1,\ldots,a_{n+1})}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)\ dx_1 \cdots dx_n\right]$ will denote the multivariate (Euler) Beta function[3] and $\Gamma : \left[\mathbb{C} - (-\mathbb{N}^*) \to \mathbb{C}; z \mapsto \int_0^{+\infty} t^{z-1}\ \mathrm{e}^{-t}\ dt\right]$ will denote the Euler Gamma function.

Recall that the Dirichlet distribution on B_n is the probability measure $\mathrm{Dir}(a_1,\ldots,a_{n+1}) = \frac{\mathscr{D}_{(a_1,\ldots,a_{n+1})}}{\mathrm{B}((a_1,\ldots,a_{n+1}))}\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n}$, and therefore that $\mathscr{C}_n * \mathrm{Dir}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1})$ is also a probability measure on C_n, whose expression, in barycentric coordinates, is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \frac{y_1^{a_1} \cdots y_{n+1}^{a_{n+1}}}{\mathrm{B}((a_1,\ldots,a_{n+1}))} \mu_{C_n}$.

3.2.1 Dirac measures

Dirac measures are used to model a perfect knowledge of the value of some physical quantity (or, less flatteringly, when uncertainties are simply ignored).

Consider $M \in U_{n+1}$ and let δ_M be the Dirac measure at M. Then trivially $\mathscr{H}_{n+1} * \delta_M = \delta_{\mathscr{H}_{n+1}(M)}$.

Note that the Dirac measure at any other point on the half-line from O to M as chosen above will yield the same transformed measure: the homogeneous transform is clearly not injective when considered on measures!

3.2.2 Further examples of the non-injectivity

The non-injectivity of the homogeneous transform is of course not restricted to measures which are singular with respect to the Lebesgues measure. Indeed, let $s > 1$ and consider $k_s : \mathbb{R}_+^* \to \mathbb{R}_+, z \mapsto \frac{\kappa_s}{1+z^{s(n+1)}}$, with $\kappa_s = \frac{(n+1)!}{\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dz}{1+z^s}}$. We now build θ_s, a measure on $\mathrm{Bor}\left(\left(\mathbb{R}_+^*\right)^{n+1}\right)$ by $\theta_s = k_s(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} y_i)\ \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}$. Lemma 3.1 proves that $(\mathscr{H}_{n+1} * \theta_s) \ll \mu_{C_n}$; we will denote $d(\mathscr{H}_{n+1} * \theta_s)/d\mu_{C_n}$ by l_s.

Note that the density of θ_s with respect to $\mu_{U_{n+1}}$ is $(y_1, \ldots, y_{n+1}) \mapsto (\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} y_i)^{n+1} k_s(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} y_i)$. Using proposition 2.3, $(\mathscr{T}_{n+1}^{-1} * \theta_s) \ll \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}$ and the density of $\mathscr{T}_{n+1}^{-1} * \theta_s$ with respect to $\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}$ is $\mathrm{e}^{(n+1)\,t}\ k_s(\mathrm{e}^t)$.

Using lemma 3.2 we find that $(\pi_{n+1} * \mathscr{T}_{n+1}^{-1} * \theta_s) \ll \left(\sqrt{n+1}\ \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n}\right)$ and that

$$\frac{d(\pi_{n+1} * \mathscr{T}_{n+1}^{-1} * \theta_s)}{d\left(\sqrt{n+1}\ \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n}\right)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{(n+1)\,t}\ k_s\left(\mathrm{e}^t\right)\ dt$$

The simple change of variables $u = \mathrm{e}^{(n+1)\,t}$ now lets us see that $\mathscr{H}_{n+1} * \theta_s = \frac{n!}{\sqrt{n+1}} \mu_{C_n}$. In other words, all the k_s are transformed by the homogeneous transform into the uniform probability on C_n.

---

[1] Brief reminder: by induction; trivially $\lambda_1(B_1) = 1$ and $\lambda_{n+1}(B_{n+1}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} \mathbb{1}(B_{n+1})\ d\lambda_{n+1}$ (with $\mathbb{1}$ being the indicator function) which by Fubini-Lebesgues is equal to $\int_{]0;1[} \lambda_n(t.B_n)\ dt$, and $\lambda_n(t.B_n) = t^n\ \lambda_n(B_n)$.

[2] By definition, $\mu_{C_n}(C_n) = \int A_{\mathscr{C}_n} \mathbb{1}(B_n)\ d\lambda_n$, and $A_{\mathscr{C}_n} = \sqrt{n+1}$.

[3] Recall that $\mathrm{B}((a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1})) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{n+1} \Gamma(a_i)}{\Gamma(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} a_i)}$, the proof of which is by noticing that, as a consequence of the Fubini-Lebesgues theorem, $\prod_{i=1}^{n+1} \Gamma(a_i) = \int_0^{+\infty} \cdots \int_0^{+\infty} t_1^{a_1-1} \cdots t_{n+1}^{a_{n+1}-1} \mathrm{e}^{-(t_1+\cdots t_{n+1})} dt_1 \cdots dt_{n+1}$, by using the change of variables $[B_n \times \mathbb{R}_+^* \to (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1}, ((x_1, \ldots, x_n), x_{n+1}) \mapsto (t_1, \ldots, t_{n+1}) = (x_1 x_{n+1}, \ldots, x_n x_{n+1}, (1 - x_1 \cdots x_n) x_{n+1})]$ and by invoking Fubini-Lebesgues once again.

3.2.3 Odds and ends

Note that if $A \in \mathrm{Bor}((\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1})$, then $A \cap C_n \in \mathrm{Bor}(C_n)$ and therefore $\mu_{C_n}(A \cap C_n)$ is well defined, and we can thus build a measure $\mathscr{R}$ on $\mathrm{Bor}((\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1})$ by $\mathscr{R}(A) = \mu_{C_n}(A \cap C_n)$. Clearly $\mathscr{R} \perp \mu_{(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1}}$, yet $\mathscr{H}_{n+1} * \mathscr{R} = \mu_{C_n}$, the uniform density on C_n, and hence is (trivially) absolutely continuous with respect to μ_{C_n}, and has the same homogeneous transform as the θ_s. This also shows that we can't expect better, from a general point of view, than what was stated in lemma 3.1.

We have seen examples of a measure which is singular with respect to $\mu_{(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1}}$ and whose homogeneous transform is singular with respect to μ_{C_n}, examples of measures which are absolutely continuous with respect to $\mu_{(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1}}$ and whose homogeneous transform are absolutely continuous with respect to μ_{C_n} and finally now an example of a measure which is singular with respect to $\mu_{(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1}}$ and whose homogeneous transform is also absolutely continuous with respect to μ_{C_n}. Is is possible to have an example of the last possibility, namely a measure which would be absolutely continuous with respect to $\mu_{(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1}}$ but whose homogeneous transform would be singular with respect to μ_{C_n}? Actually, no, as we have shown in lemma 3.1.

3.2.4 Log-normal distributions

Let Σ be a symmetric, positive definite, $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ matrix, and $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\mu}_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$; the log-normal distribution is the probability measure on $(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1}$ defined by $\mathscr{L}_{\boldsymbol{\mu},\Sigma} = f_{\boldsymbol{\mu},\Sigma}\ \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}$, with $f_{\boldsymbol{\mu},\Sigma}\colon\ (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}$ and

$$f_{\boldsymbol{\mu},\Sigma}(y_1, \ldots, y_{n+1}) = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left[\ln(y_1) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \ldots, \ln(y_{n+1}) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{n+1}\right] \Sigma^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \ln(y_1) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \ln(y_{n+1}) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{n+1} \end{bmatrix} \right)}{\sqrt{|\det(\Sigma)|}(2\pi)^{\frac{n+1}{2}} \prod_{i=1}^{n+1} y_i}$$

Note that that Σ being positive definite, we can define

$$\mathscr{V} = \left([1, \ldots, 1] \Sigma^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1}$$

and we have $\mathscr{V} > 0$. Furthermore, let

$$\mathscr{Q} = \sqrt{|\det(\Sigma)|}(2\pi)^{\frac{n+1}{2}} \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i\right) \prod_{i=1}^{n} x_i$$

$$\mathscr{X} = [1, \ldots, 1] \Sigma^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \ln(x_1) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \ln(x_n) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_n \\ \ln(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{n+1} \end{bmatrix} = \left[\ln(x_1) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \ldots, \ln(x_n) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_n, \ln\left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i\right) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{n+1}\right] \Sigma^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathscr{Y} = \left[\ln(x_1) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \ldots, \ln(x_n) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_n, \ln\left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i\right) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{n+1}\right] \Sigma^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \ln(x_1) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \ln(x_n) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_n \\ \ln(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{n+1} \end{bmatrix}$$

Proposition 3.1:
$\mathscr{H}_{n+1} * \mathscr{L}_{\boldsymbol{\mu},\Sigma} \ll \mu_{C_n}$ and $d(\mathscr{H}_{n+1} * \mathscr{L}_{\boldsymbol{\mu},\Sigma})/d\mu_{C_n} = g_{\boldsymbol{\mu},\Sigma}$, with $g_{\boldsymbol{\mu},\Sigma} \circ \mathscr{C}_n^{-1}\colon B_n \to \mathbb{R}$ and

$$g_{\boldsymbol{\mu},\Sigma} \circ \mathscr{C}_n^{-1}(\ x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi\mathscr{V}}}{\mathscr{Q}\sqrt{n+1}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left[\mathscr{Y} - \mathscr{V}\mathscr{X}^2\right] \right) \qquad \$$$

Proof: We proceed almost exactly as in 3.2.2. The first assertion is a direct result of lemma 3.1.

Note that the density of $\mathscr{L}_{\boldsymbol{\mu},\Sigma}$ with respect to $\mu_{U_{n+1}}$ is $(y_1,\ldots,y_{n+1}) \mapsto f(y_1,\ldots,y_{n+1}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} y_i\right)^{n+1}$. Using proposition 2.3, we find that $\mathscr{T}_{n+1}^{-1} * \mathscr{L}_{\boldsymbol{\mu},\Sigma} \ll \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}$ and that the density of $\mathscr{T}_{n+1}^{-1} * \mathscr{L}_{\boldsymbol{\mu},\Sigma}$ with respect to $\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}$ is $\mathrm{e}^{(n+1)\,t} f_{\boldsymbol{\mu},\Sigma}\left(\mathrm{e}^t.x_1,\ldots,\mathrm{e}^t.x_n,\mathrm{e}^t.\left(1-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\right)$.

Using lemma 3.2 we find that $(\pi_{n+1} * \mathscr{T}_{n+1}^{-1} * \mathscr{L}) \ll \left(\sqrt{n+1}\ \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n}\right)$ and that

$$\frac{d(\pi_{n+1} * \mathscr{T}_{n+1}^{-1} * \mathscr{L}_{\boldsymbol{\mu},\Sigma})}{d\left(\sqrt{n+1}\ \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n}\right)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{(n+1)\,t} f_{\boldsymbol{\mu},\Sigma}\left(\mathrm{e}^t.x_1,\ldots,\mathrm{e}^t.x_n,\mathrm{e}^t.\left(1-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\right) dt$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{e}^{(n+1)\,t} f_{\boldsymbol{\mu},\Sigma}\left(\mathrm{e}^t.x_1,\ldots,t.x_n,\mathrm{e}^t.\left(1-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\right) &= \frac{1}{\mathscr{Q}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{t^2}{\mathscr{V}} + 2\mathscr{X}\,t + \mathscr{Y}\right]\right) \\ &= \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left[\mathscr{Y} - \mathscr{V}\,\mathscr{X}^2\right]\right)}{\mathscr{Q}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\mathscr{V}}\left[t + \mathscr{V}\,\mathscr{X}\right]^2\right)\end{aligned}$$

and, classically, $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\mathscr{V}}\left[t+\mathscr{V}\,\mathscr{X}\right]^2\right) dt = \sqrt{2\pi\mathscr{V}}$. \$

Note that in barycentric coordinates, the expressions for $\mathscr{Q}$, $\mathscr{X}$ and $\mathscr{Y}$ are considerably simpler:

$$\mathscr{Q} = \sqrt{|\det(\Sigma)|}(2\pi)^{\frac{n+1}{2}} \prod_{i=1}^{n+1} y_i$$

$$\mathscr{X} = [1,\ldots,1]\Sigma^{-1}\begin{bmatrix}\ln(y_1)-\boldsymbol{\mu}_1\\ \vdots \\ \ln(y_{n+1})-\boldsymbol{\mu}_{n+1}\end{bmatrix} = [\ln(y_1)-\boldsymbol{\mu}_1,\ldots,\ln(y_{n+1})-\boldsymbol{\mu}_{n+1}]\,\Sigma^{-1}\begin{bmatrix}1\\ \vdots\\ 1\end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathscr{Y} = [\ln(y_1)-\boldsymbol{\mu}_1,\ldots,\ln(y_{n+1})-\boldsymbol{\mu}_{n+1}]\,\Sigma^{-1}\begin{bmatrix}\ln(y_1)-\boldsymbol{\mu}_1\\ \vdots\\ \ln(y_{n+1})-\boldsymbol{\mu}_{n+1}\end{bmatrix}$$

Furthermore, if Σ is diagonal, with

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix}\sigma_1^2 & 0 & \cdots & 0\\ & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \sigma_{n+1}^2\end{bmatrix}$$

then

$$\mathscr{V} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\sigma_1^2}+\cdots+\frac{1}{\sigma_{n+1}^2}} \quad , \quad \mathscr{Q} = (2\pi)^{\frac{n+1}{2}} \prod_{i=1}^{n+1} \frac{y_i}{\sigma_i} \quad , \quad \mathscr{X} = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \frac{\ln(y_i)-\boldsymbol{\mu}_i}{\sigma_i^2} \quad , \quad \mathscr{Y} = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \frac{(\ln(y_i)-\boldsymbol{\mu}_i)^2}{\sigma_i^2}$$

3.2.5 Multivariate Gamma distributions

Recall that a Gamma distribution on $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ is defined as $\gamma_{a,b}\ \lambda_{\mathbb{R}}$, with $\gamma_{a,b}(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(a)}\ b^a x^{a-1}\mathrm{e}^{-bx}$, $a>0$, $b>0$.

Let us define here a multivariate Gamma distribution $\mathscr{G}_{\alpha,\beta}$ on $(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1}$, with $\alpha = (\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_{n+1})$, $\beta = (\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_{n+1})$, $\alpha_i>0$, $\beta_i>0$, as $\mathscr{G}_{\alpha,\beta} = f_{\alpha,\beta}\ \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}$ with $f_{\alpha,\beta}(y_1,\ldots,y_{n+1}) = \gamma_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}(y_1)\cdots\gamma_{\alpha_{n+1},\beta_{n+1}}(y_{n+1})$.

Proposition 3.2:
$\mathscr{H}_{n+1} * \mathscr{G}_{\alpha,\beta} \ll \mu_{C_n}$ and $d(\mathscr{H}_{n+1} * \mathscr{G}_{\alpha,\beta})/d\mu_{C_n} = g_{\alpha,\beta}$, with $g_{\alpha,\beta} \circ \mathscr{C}_n^{-1} \colon B_n \to \mathbb{R}$

$$g_{\alpha,\beta} \circ \mathscr{C}_n^{-1}(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \frac{\mathscr{D}_\alpha(x_1,\ldots,x_n)}{\mathrm{B}((\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_{n+1}))} \frac{\beta_1^{\alpha_1}\cdots\beta_{n+1}^{\alpha_{n+1}}}{\left[\beta_1 x_1+\cdots+\beta_n x_n+\beta_{n+1}\left(1-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\right]^{\alpha_1+\cdots+\alpha_{n+1}}} \quad \$$

Proof: We proceed exactly as in 3.2.4. The first assertion is a direct result of lemma 3.1. Likewise, $g_{\alpha,\beta}\circ\mathscr{C}_n^{-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{(\alpha_1+\cdots+\alpha_{n+1})\,t}\,\frac{\beta_1^{\alpha_1}\cdots\beta_{n+1}^{\alpha_{n+1}}}{\Gamma(\alpha_1)\cdots\Gamma(\alpha_{n+1})}x_1^{\alpha_1-1}\cdots x_n^{\alpha_n-1}(1-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^{\alpha_{n+1}-1}\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{e}^t\left[\beta_1 x_1+\cdots+\beta_n x_n+\beta_{n+1}\left(1-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\right]}dt.$

We now use the change of variables $[\mathbb{R}_+^* \to \mathbb{R}; u \mapsto t = \ln(u)]$ and find that $g_{\alpha,\beta}\circ\mathscr{C}_n^{-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}}\frac{(\beta_1^{\alpha_1}\cdots\beta_{n+1}^{\alpha_{n+1}})[x_1^{\alpha_1-1}\cdots x_n^{\alpha_n-1}\left(1-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)^{\alpha_{n+1}}]}{\Gamma(\alpha_1)\cdots\Gamma(\alpha_{n+1})}\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^*} u^{\alpha_1+\cdots\alpha_{n+1}-1}\,\mathrm{e}^{-u\left[\beta_1 x_1+\cdots+\beta_n x_n+\beta_{n+1}\left(1-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\right]}du.$

We identify the last integral as the (unilateral) Laplace transform of $\left[u\mapsto u^{\alpha_1+\cdots\alpha_{n+1}-1}\right]$ for $p = \beta_1 x_1 + \cdots + \beta_n x_n + \beta_{n+1}\left(1-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)$ and we therefore know ([9]) that $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^*} u^{\alpha_1+\cdots\alpha_{n+1}-1}\,\mathrm{e}^{-u\left[\beta_1 x_1+\cdots+\beta_n x_n+\beta_{n+1}\left(1-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\right]}du = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_1+\cdots+\alpha_{n+1})}{\left[\beta_1 x_1+\cdots+\beta_n x_n+\beta_{n+1}\left(1-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\right]^{\alpha_1+\cdots+\alpha_{n+1}}}$. \$

3.2.6 Multivariate Chi distributions

Recall that a Chi distribution on $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ is defined as $\chi_k\,\lambda_{\mathbb{R}}$ with $\chi_k(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)}\,2^{1-\frac{k}{2}}\,x^{k-1}\,\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}$, $k>0$. Let us define here a multivariate Chi distribution $\mathrm{X}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ on $(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{n+1}$, with $\boldsymbol{k} = (k_1,\ldots,k_{n+1})$, as $\mathrm{X}_{\boldsymbol{k}} = f_{\boldsymbol{k}}\,\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}$ with $f_{\boldsymbol{k}}(y_1,\ldots,y_{n+1}) = \chi_{k_1}(y_1)\cdots\chi_{k_{n+1}}(y_{n+1})$.

Proposition 3.3:
$\mathscr{H}_{n+1}*\mathrm{X}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \ll \mu_{C_n}$ and $d(\mathscr{H}_{n+1}*\mathrm{X}_{\boldsymbol{k}})/d\mu_{C_n} = g_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, with $g_{\boldsymbol{k}}\circ\mathscr{C}_n^{-1}\colon B_n\to\mathbb{R}$ and

$$g_{\boldsymbol{k}}\circ\mathscr{C}_n^{-1}(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}}\,\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{k_1+\cdots+k_{n+1}}{2^{n+1}}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{k_1}{2}\right)\cdots\Gamma\left(\frac{k_{n+1}}{2}\right)}\,2^{(n+1)-(k_1+\cdots+k_{n+1})\frac{n}{2(n+1)}}\,\frac{x_1^{k_1-1}\cdots x_n^{k_n-1}(1-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^{k_{n+1}-1}}{[x_1\cdots x_n(1-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i)]^{\frac{k_1+\cdots+k_{n+1}}{n+1}}}$$

\$

Proof: We once again proceed exactly as in 3.2.4. We are led to evaluate $\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mathrm{e}^{t(k_1+\cdots+k_{n+1})}\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{2}\left[x_1^2\cdot x_n^2\left(1-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)^2\right]}\mathrm{e}^{t2(n+1)}$, we use the change of variables $[\mathbb{R}_+^*\to\mathbb{R}; u\mapsto t = \frac{1}{2(n+1)}\ln(u)]$ and we identify the (unilateral) Laplace transform of $\left[u\mapsto u^{\frac{1}{2(n+1)}(k_1+\cdots k_{n+1})-1}\right]$ for $p = \frac{1}{2}\left[x_1^2\cdots x_n^2\ \left(1-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)^2\right]$. \$

3.3 Further considerations

For display purposes, or as a step in data classification, it is usually advantageous to lower the dimensionality. There is of course an infinite number of ways of embedding C_n into $\mathbb{R}^n$, even among affine transforms, and there does not seem to be a universally agreed-upon "best" way to do so for these tasks in the general case, except perhaps for the homogeneous transforms of bivariate and trivariate data. When transforming a bivariate distribution, a convenient representation is to represent the density as a function of the percentage of one of the variables (in essence, illustrating the density thru $\mathscr{C}_n$); an example of such is shown[4] in Figure 2. For trivariate data, especially if classification is intended, it is advantageous to use an isometric representation of the homogeneous transform and this is shown in figure 3.

When using the measures showcased here to represent uncertainty about measures, one should bear in mind that their behaviour is somewhat different than that of the common Gaussian distribution. In particular, save for some select values of the parameters and levels, level curves of the densities do not enclose convex domains.

Finally, one should note that, when μ is null, the homogeneous transform of the log-normal distribution presents striking symetries.

[4]These figures were made using Matplotlib ([10]), a 2D graphics package used for the Python programming language (Python Software Foundation, `https://www.python.org`)



Figure 2: A bivariate Gamma distribution and its homogeneous transform.



Figure 3: The homogeneous transform of a trivariate log-normal distribution.

References

[1] M. J. Greenberg and J. R. Harper, "Algebraic topology - a first course", The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company, 1981.

[2] D. Leborgne, "Calcul différentiel et géométrie", Presses Universitaires de France, 1982.

[3] V.-K. Khoan, "Distributions, analyse de fourier, oprateurs aux drives partielles - tome 1", Librairie Vuibert, 1972.

[4] N. Bourbaki, "Topologie générale", Masson.

[5] T. Voronov, "Differentiable manifolds - fall 2009 (lecture notes)". http://www.maths.manchester.ac.uk/ tv/Teaching/Differentiable Manifolds/2009-2010/, 2009.

[6] W. Rudin, "Real and complex analysis", Mc Graw-Hill International Editions, third ed., 1986.

[7] P. Malliavin, "Intégration et probabilités; analyse de Fourier et analyse spectrale", Masson, 1982.

[8] M. Métivier and J. Neveu, "Théorie de la mesure et de l'intégration - fascicule annexe au cours de probabilités", École Polytechnique, Édition 1983 ed., 1983.

[9] R. V. Churchill, "Operational mathematics", McGraw-Hill Companies, 1958.

[10] J. D. Hunter, "Matplotlib: A 2d graphics environment", *Computing In Science & Engineering* **9** (2007), no. 3, 90–95.